

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to correct minor grammatical and idiomatic informalities. The changes made to the specification are deemed to be self-evident from the original disclosure, and thus are not deemed to raise any issues of new matter.

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 22 and 23 are added by the present response. Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,517,474 to Takamine. Claims 2-18, 20, and 21 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the early indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 2-8, 20, and 21.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Takamine, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of independent claims 1 and 19 is amended by the present response to make clarifications therein. Specifically, those claims clarify that the track has “a track shape of concentric tracks or a spiral track”, and the generated eccentricity signal is based on a center of the track shape.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 19 distinguish over Takamine, and particularly with respect to Takamine not teaching or suggesting the eccentricity signal generating circuit recited in the claims.

The outstanding Office Action relies upon Takamine to teach:

an eccentricity signal generating circuit (Fig. 4, element  
See also column 12, lines 20-30) configured to generate an  
eccentricity showing a position deviation between the center  
point of the track of the disk and the rotation center point of the

disk on the basis of the output of the information signal generating circuit;<sup>1</sup>

In response to that basis for the outstanding rejection applicants note that Takamine discloses at column 12, lines 34-36 that “the light spot on the disk 7 is controlled so that it is continuously located at the *track center*” (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the use of the term “track center” in Takamine differs from the recited recitations to the “center point of the track shape of the disk”, as recited in amended claims 1 and 19. More specifically, the term “track center” in Takamine is depicted in Figure 7(b) therein and a description is given in the corresponding description at column 11, line 46. As evident from such disclosures in Takamine the light spot is moved by the galvano-mirror recorder 19 in a track width direction to cross the track to trace the *center line of the track* by the light spot.

In contrast to such a disclosure in Takamine, the “center point of the track shape” recited in claims 1 and 19 is shown, as a non-limiting example, in Figure 2 in the present specification in which point A is defined as a center point of tracks T-1, T or T+1.<sup>2</sup> Further, as noted in the present specification at page 15, lines 20-22 the track has a shape such that “concentric tracks or a spiral track [are] formed on the disk 11”.

As clear from the above-noted descriptions in the present specification, and in comparison with the teachings in Takamine, the “track center” noted in Takamine resides within a target track, i.e., is a center of each actual track, whereas the center point of the track shape of the present claims does not reside within any target track, but instead is a point generally at a center of a disk. More particularly, applicants note that the center point A shown in Fig. 2 is defined as a center point of a track shape T, for example, and the track center in Takamine is defined as a “center line” of each track.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of December 5, 2003, page 2, last line to page 3, line 4.

<sup>2</sup> See for example the present specification at page 3, lines 13-18.

In such ways, the claims recite a center point A such as shown in Figure 2A that is ideally a complete center of a disk, whereas the "center line" noted in Takamine does not correspond to such a center point but instead is a center of each individual track.

The presently submitted amendments to claims 1 and 19 are believed to clarify such subject matter, to thereby clarify differences between those claims as currently written and the teachings in Takamine.


In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 1 and 19 distinguish over the teachings in Takamine.

The present response also sets forth new claims 22 and 23 for examination that are also believed to distinguish over the applied art. Applicants note the integrated circuit configuration set forth in new claims 22 and 23 is shown, as a non-limiting example, in Figure 4 in the present specification and is also described at page 19, line 26 to page 20, line 3 in the present specification. New claims 22 and 23 are also believed to distinguish over the applied art for similar reasons as discussed above.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Registration No. 28,870  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
SNS:smi  
I:\ATTY\SNS\193220US-AM.DOC